

not to exceed 350 CIS, or 750 hours TIS since the last inspection, whichever occurs earlier.

(4) If side links are found cracked, replace the cracked side links and pylon attachment bolts with serviceable parts, and inspect the fail-safe bolt and platform lug in accordance with paragraph 2.B of GEAE CF6-50 SB No. 72-1092, dated November 18, 1994, prior to further flight.

(b) Refurbish the left-hand and right-hand side links identified in paragraph (a) of this AD at the next engine shop visit after the effective date of this AD in accordance with paragraph 2.C of GEAE CF6-50 SB No. 72-1092, dated November 18, 1994.

Refurbishment of side links in accordance with this paragraph constitutes terminating action to the on-wing inspection requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(c) For the purpose of this AD, an engine shop visit is defined as the induction of an engine into a shop for maintenance involving the separation of the fan and core modules.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Engine Certification Office. The request should be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Engine Certification Office.

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternate methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Engine Certification Office.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 22, 1995.

James C. Jones,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-8444 Filed 4-3-95; 1:31 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-NM-20-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes; Model MD-88 Airplanes; and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and Model DC-9-80 series airplanes; Model MD-88 airplanes; and C-9 (military) series airplanes; that currently requires visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, and replacement of the assembly, if necessary. That AD was prompted by several occurrences of

failure of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly due to broken detent lugs.

This action would expand the applicability of the existing AD to include additional airplanes. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-20-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90801-1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Technical Administrative Support, Dept. LS1, M.C. 2-98. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Augusto Co, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5225; fax (310) 627-5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments,

in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 95-NM-20-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-20-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On December 9, 1992, the FAA issued AD 92-27-07, amendment 39-8441 (57 FR 60116, December 18, 1992), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and Model DC-9-80 series airplanes; Model MD-88 airplanes; and C-9 (military) series airplanes. That AD requires visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, and replacement of the assembly, if necessary. That action was prompted by several occurrences of failure of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly due to broken detent lugs. The actions required by that AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability.

Since the issuance of AD 92-27-07, the manufacturer has advised the FAA that several additional airplanes have been identified that are subject to the same type of cracking of the rudder pedals adjust hub assembly as addressed by that AD. These airplanes were inadvertently omitted from the effectivity listing of McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-235, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992. AD 92-27-07 referenced that specific listing of airplanes as those subject to the requirements of that AD. In light of this, the FAA has determined that those additional airplanes are subject to the same unsafe condition addressed by AD 92-27-07.

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1994. This revised service bulletin is essentially identical to the original version, which was cited in AD 92-27-07 as the appropriate source of service

information, but revises the effectivity listing to include additional airplanes.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 92-27-07 to continue to require visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly and replacement of the assembly, if necessary. This proposal also would expand the applicability of the existing AD to include additional airplanes. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this notice to clarify this long-standing requirement.

There are approximately 909 Model DC-9 and Model DC-9-80 series airplanes; Model MD-88 airplanes; and C-9 (military) series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 561 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$180 per airplane.

The actions specified in this proposed rule previously were required by AD 92-27-07, which was applicable to approximately 373 airplanes. Based on the figures discussed above, the total cost impact of the current requirements of that AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$67,140. In consideration of the compliance time and effective date of AD 92-27-07, the FAA assumes that operators of the 373 airplanes subject to that AD have already initiated the required actions. The proposed AD action would add no

new costs associated with those airplanes.

This proposed action would be applicable to approximately 188 additional airplanes. Based on the figures discussed above, the total new costs to U.S. operators that would be imposed by this AD are estimated to be \$33,840. This figure is based on assumptions that no operator of these additional airplanes has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-8441 (57 FR 60116, December 18, 1992), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 95-NM-07-AD. Supersedes AD 92-27-07, Amendment 39-8441.

Applicability: Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 series airplanes; Model DC 9-81 (MD-81), -82 (MD-82), -83 (MD-83), and -87 (MD-87) series airplanes; Model MD-88 airplanes; and Model C-9 (military) series airplanes; as listed in McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (c) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1993: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings or within 270 days after January 22, 1993 (the effective date of AD 92-27-07, amendment 39-8441), whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995.

(1) If no cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, repeat the inspections at intervals not to exceed 3,500 landings.

(2) If cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, replace the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, with a new assembly having the same part number, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995. Thereafter, conduct visual and eddy current inspections of the replacement rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly in accordance with this paragraph.

(b) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995, and not subject to paragraph (a) of this AD: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings or within 270 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995.

(1) If no cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, repeat the inspections at intervals not to exceed 3,500 landings.

(2) If cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, replace the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, with a new assembly having the same part number, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A27-325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995. Thereafter, conduct visual and eddy current inspections of the replacement rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly in accordance with this paragraph.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 31, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-8448 Filed 4-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 409

Request for Comments Concerning Rule Concerning Incandescent Lamp (Light Bulb) Industry

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (the "Commission"), as part of a systematic review of all its current regulations and guides, is

requesting public comments about the overall costs and benefits, as well as the overall regulatory and economic impact, of the Rule Concerning Incandescent Lamp (Light Bulb) Industry ("the Light Bulb Rule" or "the Rule"). All interested persons are hereby given notice of the opportunity to submit written data, views and arguments concerning this review of the Rule.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until June 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-159, Sixth and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20580. Comments about the Light Bulb Rule should be identified as "16 CFR Part 409—Comment."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Terrence J. Boyle or Kent C. Howerton, Attorneys, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC 20580, (202) 326-3016 or (202) 326-3013.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has determined, as part of its oversight responsibilities, to review periodically all its rules and guides. The information obtained in such reviews assists the Commission in identifying rules and guides that warrant modification or rescission. The Commission decided to schedule its regulatory review of the Light Bulb Rule for 1995 when, pursuant to a directive of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the Commission in April 1994 amended the Appliance Labeling Rule, 16 CFR Part 305, to add incandescent and fluorescent lamps as covered products. Although there are no contradictions between the two rules, the Commission scheduled review of the Light Bulb Rule for this year so it could consider whether to retain, revise or delete any of its provisions that might overlap the amended Appliance Labeling Rule.¹

¹ The two Rules both cover A-type incandescent lamps and require on their labels disclosure of certain performance ratings and other information. Specifically, both rules require disclosures of light output, wattage and laboratory life ratings. The Appliance Labeling Rule specifies that these disclosures must appear together, in that order and worded in a certain way (i.e., as "Light Output: _____ Lumens; Energy Used: _____ Watts; Life: _____ Hours") on the label's principal display panel. The Light Bulb Rule, however, does not specify any order or wording for its required rating disclosures, but simply specifies that the three ratings be disclosed in terms of lumens, watts and hours and appear together on at least two side panels of the label and, additionally, on any other panel on which a lumen, wattage or hours of life claim is made.

The Appliance Labeling Rule requires the lumens, watts and hours disclosures to appear with equal conspicuousness, but does not specify any particular type style or size. The Light Bulb Rule specifies that the lumens and hours disclosures must both be in a medium- or bold-face type that

A. Background

The Rule was promulgated by the Commission in 1970.² The Light Bulb Rule makes it an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in connection with the sale in commerce of general service incandescent electric lamps (light bulbs) to:

(1) Fail to disclose clearly and conspicuously on the containers of such lamps (or, if there are no containers, on the bulbs themselves) their average initial wattage, average initial lumens and average laboratory life;

(2) Fail to disclose clearly and conspicuously on the bulbs themselves their average initial wattage and design voltage;

(3) Represent or imply energy savings resulting from a lamp's life expectancy or light output unless in computing such savings the following factors are taken into account and disclosed clearly and conspicuously for the lamp being sold and also (unless the comparison is only of initial purchase price between lamps of identical wattage, lumens and laboratory life) the lamp with which the comparison is being made: lamp cost, electrical power cost, labor cost for lamp replacement (if any), actual light output in average initial lumens, and average laboratory life in hours;

(4) Represent or imply that a lamp will give more light, maintain brightness longer or furnish longer life without clearly and conspicuously disclosing, for both the lamp being sold and the lamp with which the comparison is being made the average initial wattage, the laboratory life in hours, the average initial light output in lumens, and (if there is a claim the lamp maintains brightness longer) the light output in lumens at 70% of the lamp's rated life.

Four notes at the end of the Rule define terms used in the Rule or require certain procedures or tests to be used in making disclosures required by the Rule. Specifically, these notes: (1) State how manufacturers are to determine the

is at least two-fifths the height of the watts disclosure on the same panel or three-sixteenths of an inch, whichever is larger.

The Appliance Labeling Rule requires that energy saving or operating cost claims take into consideration, and clearly and conspicuously disclose in close proximity to the claims, all the assumptions upon which the claims are based, including, e.g., purchase price, unit cost of electricity, hours of use, patterns of use. The Light Bulb Rule, because it covers not only energy saving and operating cost claims, but also all comparative lamp life, light output and lamp cost claims, specifies additional factors (e.g., labor costs for replacement, light output, life expectancy) that, depending on the particular claim being made, must be taken into consideration and clearly and conspicuously disclosed.

² 35 FR 11784 (July 23, 1970).